

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

January 22, 2007

5:30 PM

Chairman Garrity called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Garrity, O'Neil, Osborne, Gatsas Duval
Aldermen Lopez, Forest

Messrs.: Robert MacKenzie, Sam Maranto, Kevin Sheppard, Ron Ludwig

Chairman Garrity addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Amending resolution and budget authorization for the FY2007 CIP 210107 Homeless Healthcare Program in the amount of \$7,376.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Alderman Gatsas stated just a question because they're all looking as though they appear to be the same thing. Are these just additional funds that have come in from the time we put our CIP budget together? Does that normally happen every year?

Mr. Sam Maranto replied yes it does, Alderman.

Alderman Gatsas stated and those funds can't go anywhere else?

Mr. Maranto replied they're specific for those projects.

Alderman Gatsas stated thank you.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Amending resolution and budget authorization for the FY2007 CIP 411007 NH Sobriety Checkpoint Program in the amount of \$2,680.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Amending resolution and budget authorization for the FY2007 CIP 411307 Project Safe Neighborhoods Program in the amount of \$23,920.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Amending resolution and budget authorization for the FY2007 CIP 411507 Stop Violence Against Women (VAWA) Program in the amount of \$24,000.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Amending resolution and budget authorization for the FY2007 CIP 610407 Housing Rehab/Lead Hazard Control Program in the amount of \$1,800,000.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Alderman O'Neil stated Bob you and I spoke last week. I know we had two different grants out for lead programs. One we had held some funding for a match, is this that one or is this another Housing Rehab/Lead Hazard Program?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we've had two grant applications that were not approved but I think the funding is the same, the match that we had to hold back for this one was the same.

Alderman O'Neil stated so the funding that we put off to the side for the local match that will be applicable to this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Amending resolution and budget authorizations for the FY2007 CIP 811407 Manchester VISTA Initiative Program in the amount of \$10,500 and from another project.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorizations.

Alderman O'Neil stated just clarification, Mr. Chairman. We are working...the Mayor's office at the lead trying to find a home for Mr. Hebert.

Chairman Garrity stated that's what I've been told.

Alderman O'Neil stated and as he said he'd take a garage space at the Highway garage or something if that's what it took...but that is moving forward to the best of your knowledge.

Chairman Garrity replied yes.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. CIP Budget Authorization:
710905 Parking & Traffic Improvements – Revision #1

Alderman O'Neil moved for discussion. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked I'm just curious is this general needs or is this going to a specific project?

Mr. MacKenzie replied this is simply changing the administration of a previous fund from the old Traffic Department to the Traffic Division of the Highway Department.

Chairman O'Neil stated that's fine, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman Garrity stated housekeeping basically, right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Discussion requested by Alderman Duval relative to a resident sidewalk funding proposal.

Alderman Duval moved for discussion. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Duval stated I appreciate the indulgence of you and the Committee members with regard to discussion pertaining to sidewalk and curbing enhancement throughout our City. It's no surprise to any Alderman sitting on this board I'm sure. Aldermen have been sitting on this Board for quite some time that it has been a constant challenge to continue to address the issue of sidewalks and curbing where it's needed throughout our City. I know as a newly elected Ward Alderman I get numerous calls from residents who are looking at deteriorating sidewalk conditions and lack of curbing and don't have the capacity to address the conditions themselves even with the use of the current 50/50 Program and they're somewhat disappointed when they find out that the City is not in a position to assume complete responsibility for the construction or replacement of curbing and sidewalks. I know throughout Ward 4 we have a number of streets where sidewalks are in significant deterioration including our grand Hanover Street that faces City Hall here. Alderman O'Neil I'm sure could back me up on this that Hanover Street one of our obvious gateways to the City lacks sidewalks and has for decades and a lot of the conditions of sidewalks are just so deteriorated that they're nearly impassable. So, I got to thinking that perhaps the City could reach out to City residents and assist them by way of a funding mechanism over a three or four or five year period on the portion of their contribution to the construction of sidewalk or reconstruction of sidewalks in some instances and replacement of curbing. I think it's a significant challenge the City has and I think it's incumbent upon this Board to maybe establish a framework so that future Boards and further Mayoral administrations can more completely address the conditions that exist out there and again in discussion with Mr. MacKenzie and it's a discussion that I'm presenting to this Committee tonight perhaps putting together a program that will allow ward residents to participate in the 50/50 Program, for us to make a

recommitment to the 50/50 Program by increasing funding over the next five years and allowing residents who participate in the 50/50 Program to come to the City and ask them to in a sense at a no interest plan essentially loan to them over a three or four or five year period their portion of contribution to the construction.

Perhaps we could get more participation by City residents and in the process look to enhance the effort over the next decade or so and I think it's really, really required. I'm sure you will support me...each of the Ward Aldermen will on the deteriorating conditions that exist throughout most of our City's wards and I think if we fail to neglect it it's going to be that much more costly to address in the future. I don't know if Mr. MacKenzie might want to comment, Mr. Chairman, if you'd allow it.

Chairman Garrity stated sure.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do concur that we have a lot of very sad shaped sidewalks in the City and there's a lot of gaps where there are no sidewalks and as we try to encourage a City that's much more walkable and easier to get around sidewalks is perhaps is the most important thing. Sidewalks can be very expensive though and I would like to help the Committee look at ways to maybe make it easier as Alderman Duval said to participate in the 50/50 Program. There will be streets though in areas that the City should be stepping up and paying for the whole cost themselves though. There are key streets that people...there's a lot of traffic and people walk on...those should be areas like areas near schools where the City is stepping up and doing sidewalks but there'll be other areas of the City where it's not as critical and having the sidewalks done through 50/50 makes sense for the City.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you Mr. Chairman and I appreciate my Ward Alderman bringing this issue forward. I think it's a good idea if every year that I've been on the Board I think the 50/50 Sidewalk Program, Sidewalk and Curbing Program has existed and maybe Mr. Sheppard...he's been with the City for a little while...I don't think we've ever had a surplus of funds. We always seem to be not short of funds but whatever the funding amount is we go through pretty quickly. We always have a significant amount of applicants and it's always been treated on a first-come, first-serve basis. So, I think it's one of our more successful programs. If there's a way we can expand it or get creative to fill in some of those gaps in some of these areas tie it to...I know they've had an on-going School Sidewalk Program...we had places especially in the southend of the City that had no sidewalks at all. So, I appreciate Alderman Duval bringing this issue forward, I think it's something worth looking at and if we can get a little more creative in either expanding the 50/50 Program or other programs to improve our sidewalks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Osborne stated I think so too. The main thoroughfares like Bridge Street and Lake Avenue and Spruce and Cilley Road and of course the west side as well...Kelley Street...I think those are the one that the City should look at first. I think this is what would be the big picture where most of the people do travel and are able to walk. As far as what Alderman Duval was stating about the money in a loan program. How would we police that with collections if they're going to sell the homes and move from one state to the other and whatever else. I don't want to bring that up now but that's one of the things I had on my mind. Do you think it's possible? I'd love it, I'm not against it I'm just saying.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we're going to have to get creative...it can't be like a typical loan because frankly the sidewalk is not owned by the homeowner...the sidewalk is owned by the City. So, they don't really have collateral to hold against them if it was a traditional loan. So, I do think that we have to look at ways perhaps through special assessments or other ways but I haven't figured those out yet.

Alderman Osborne stated I think the main thoroughfares would be the first to look at wouldn't it be. Thank you.

Chairman Garrity stated with the road reconstruction funds in certain areas of the City they are installing sidewalks when they do that, is that right?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think in almost all cases where the new roads are going in they are putting at least sidewalks on one side of the street.

Alderman Duval stated perhaps we can continue to explore and as Mr. MacKenzie says be more creative with regard to possibly enhancing the 50/50 Program and just look at ways to increase participation to the extent that the budget will allow but to think creatively about helping ward residents participate in the 50/50 Program and again continue to work with CIP and Mr. MacKenzie to try to come up with a plan and maybe come back to the Committee over the next 30-60 days.

Chairman Garrity stated so it would be your recommendation that Mr. MacKenzie come back with a creative plan of some sort in 30-60 days.

Alderman Duval stated yes I'd like to see that happen if possible, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Garrity stated I don't think we need a motion on that...duly noted, Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just had a question for Mr. Sheppard. Kevin, the 50/50 contract that goes out now when they start in the springtime through the fall do they stay pretty busy with the crew of whoever the successful contractor is?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, replied most of the time they do. We've had instances in the past where the 50/50 contractor and say our sidewalk contractor when we put out school sidewalk are the same so sometimes they'll jump between but it is fairly consistent whether they're putting in curbing or sidewalks...they stay pretty fairly busy.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know you had a crew at one time that was dedicated to sidewalk curbing and construction...they're almost exclusively now assigned to as part of when you do the in-house Street Reconstruction Program, am I correct?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct. Back then we were not doing street reconstruction in-house and now they're spending their time doing that work.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that a possibility expanding the size of that crew or creating another in-house crew?

Mr. Sheppard replied it's possible but it's a manpower thing...so it would come down to manpower. Right now our sidewalk crew say is dedicated. At times we try to get two curb crews going to keep the sidewalk crew stay with the schedule.

Alderman Duval asked Mr. Sheppard are you finding or would you know if the funds that were budgeted last year...were they used up and were they used up by a certain time or was there a balance?

Mr. Sheppard replied this year Alderman O'Neil brought that up a little bit earlier. In previous years we got an allocation of \$100,000 city matching to \$100,000 resident and that was spent fairly quickly. This year there was an allocation of \$400,000 over the two years (2007-2008) budget years...we've spent about \$125,000 of that so everyone that wanted a sidewalk this year is probably the first time it's ever happened actually got sidewalk or curbing as part of the program. The \$400,000 that was allocated will allow us now to start construction a little bit earlier because typically we didn't get the money...the money was not available until June/July and the construction was not starting until say July or August. Now, we've got the money up front from the two previous years so we'll be able to start the 50/50 Program as soon as the weather allows us to. So, I guess to

answer your question it's a long answer but this year was the first year we actually had...I don't want to say excess funds but funds that we can now carry over so everyone that wanted a sidewalk or curb project this year did get it...that's the first year it's every happened.

Alderman Lopez asked that was cash?

Mr. Sheppard replied I believe that was a bond.

Alderman Lopez stated a two-year bond...that leads me to my next question...if we have so many sidewalks in the City why couldn't we have a larger bond and try to work this out on a priority basis like you mentioned the schools are number one priority...number two priority in the areas...I know that two years ago we went through the same process and GIS was showing some areas that sidewalks were really bad that we should take care of. Maybe somewhere we need to bond more money in order for this program to really work...the 50/50 works and as you go through the people that did the 50/50 naturally they're going to come back and ask to have a break too so just keep that in mind as we move forward but if we bond in 2009 maybe we can bond more money if we know what the priorities in the City are because we all know that every ward needs it but which are the more important areas in the City where the sidewalks need to be done. Thank you very much.

Alderman Osborne asked Kevin aren't most of the sidewalks at the schools done...they were done 20 years ago when they started on that. How much more do you have to do with schools?

Mr. Sheppard replied I guess I'm not prepared to answer that question but most of the sidewalks directly abutting schools are complete. The original plan was to take a look at a one-third mile radius around schools and walking routes to schools for children that don't have bus routes...those are some of the streets we're looking at. We're also looking at sidewalks within that radius of schools that are not in good condition and maybe need reconstruction so these aren't always necessarily a new sidewalk...sometimes it may be a reconstruction of an older sidewalk in need of repairs.

Alderman Osborne stated a lot of those have been done too like Lincoln Street where I am...they ran Lincoln Street down to get to Beech Street and to come up to Wilson Street and I guess didn't you do Huse Road not too long ago...quite long stretches. So, a lot of those are done as well. Maybe in the future I'd like to see the others done...the main thoroughfares anyway to start with.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from Alderman Lopez requesting the establishment of a fund with about \$25,000 initially for the replacement of bad or broken Veteran's Memorial Markers throughout the City with the initial replacement of a metal marker at Hunt Pool in Sheehan/Basquil Park on Maple Street.

Alderman Osborne moved to discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated as the letter so indicates regarding Verteran's markers. We reconstructed different areas in the City of Manchester and sometimes we have to move them and sometimes the markers are either missing and in one or two cases they might be wooden ones and sometimes they're stolen and they need to be replaced. Working with the Chairman and Alderman O'Neil and a few others we talked about the plaques over at Sheehan/Basquil Park...the plaque is going to be paid by the insurance company through Harry Ntapalis to replace the plaque and as we put the three plaques over there we're looking at ways that we're going to put them into a granite type marker so they are not taken out. There are some other locations in the City where there might need maintenance on some of the markers and not only painting and straightening them out and in some cases we're going to have to move them because they're not accessible to the public. The cost as indicated is \$3,700 to replace one. There is no intention whatsoever... I provided a book and hope that everybody received one of all of the markers in the City. I just want to note to the Committee that eventually we'll probably have a marker for some of the Iraqi veterans that we'll have to look at as a City to put them either in a location where they were raised, went to school or whatever the case may be. Just to make sure that we have the necessary funds for the veterans so that when we want parks to do something or Highway that they have resources other than waiting until we find it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would just like to applaud you, Mr. chairman and Alderman Lopez for your work on this. It started with I believe St. Pierre Square in south Manchester in our road reconstruction project. I think this is very appropriate. My only issue is to make sure that what was designed at St. Pierre Square and I think is shown as part of our attachment that granite base is what we adopt and what is used consistently throughout the City. I think that's what one of the problems has been...inconsistency. I hope that's part of what we do moving

forward...none of the monuments are going to be easy to see by car but at least if you're walking by you can stop and see it and read it and learn a little bit about the individual. I don't know is there a request for the \$25,000 or are we looking that that might be the amount to get a formal program going we might need.

Alderman Lopez stated that's an amount to get a formal program moving forward...it could be \$20,000, \$25,000...just to make sure. I know that there are going to be initial expenses roughly \$10,000 or \$12,000 to do some of the things over at Sheehan/Basquil Park...yes, just to get the funds there so that the Director and Highway know when we come up with these situations that they know where the money is.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we have funds...I know you mentioned the insurance money...do we have the funds to move formally?

Alderman Lopez stated I think I'd ask Ron Ludwig because he's been working with Harry Ntapalis on the plaque that was stolen or misplaced whatever the case may be at Sheehan/Basquil Park.

Chairman Garrity stated I'm glad Alderman Osborne did mention our Iraqi veterans...there's one for Adams Brooks in Veterans Park and you're not going to see if unless you fall over it...it's totally inappropriate...a recent death in Iraq, a Central grad.

Mr. Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery, stated Harry has agreed to pay for the missing plaque at Hunt Pool, Sheehan/Basquil Park...that ones there. The problem becomes that these veterans markers are placed on poles and in that area we've replaced them probably three times now...keep breaking them off the poles. For some reason in the rest of the City they seem to last but down there we keep losing them and then they steal the plaques...we do have two out of the three...one is missing. We're looking for a less expensive way to get them mounted in granite and that's the issue right now...when you go strict granite that big it gets pretty expensive but we're looking for a better way to do it.

Chairman Garrity stated from what I remember from the recently released Parks Improvement Plan those squares were a pretty high priority were they not...all those squares throughout the City...the small monument squares.

Mr. Ludwig stated they looked at every one of them and yes we'd like them all to look a little bit better but in looking at them again and as the Master Plan identified the bronze plaques that we have up are nice...they're not always displayed in the greatest way in terms of landscaping around them but the plaques themselves are nice and in pretty good shape.

Alderman O'Neil asked Ron is there money to put the granite markers at Sheehan/Basquil?

Mr. Ludwig replied no not at this time.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we get an estimate on that?

Mr. Ludwig replied we have a preliminary estimate and it was a little expensive we thought.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that similar to what was done at St. Pierre Square?

Mr. Ludwig replied what you have at St. Pierre Square is a piece of granite that we've used at some other places but not for veterans markers and that came from our office but that's a 2 x 2 and if you noticed the one at St. Pierre it's square and most of the ones that we have on veterans markers in different squares have this little bump at the top that has a star which makes that plaque larger and that plaque is not going to fit on that 2 x 2 x 4 high granite post exactly. So you'd have to make that granite piece a little bit bigger.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's what I'm looking at...to get a standard where no matter what we're doing in the City in honoring the veteran we have a design standard, that's the standard done whether it's a square in south Manchester, west Manchester or park that we don't have different designs...it's the same design. I understand the case of Sheehan/Basquil we need to order at least two...that that may require a little bigger base of granite but that's my feeling. We should have a standard design throughout the City.

Alderman Forest stated on the memorial for Rene Gagnon in Victory Park were you involved in that one because that's a fairly good size one.

Mr. Ludwig stated there are different sizes...we have 11 basically that are dedicated like Corey Square I think even St. Pierre Square was of the same style originally but it was made out of wood if you look back in time.

Alderman Forest stated similar to Lafayette Park that was made out of wood also.

Mr. Ludwig stated when they did St. Pierre Square over they went with just a more square...it looks fine but it doesn't have that star on the top which you'd typically see on about 11 other squares throughout the City so it changes the dimensions of what that piece of granite would need to be. I don't know where... somebody came up with a standard at some point because all of these have this start at the top and then they kind of take on a different shape...they're nice but they're not exactly the same as the one at St. Pierre Square right now.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the point has been raised but just to make sure...it's not to replace what we have in place...but to replace if somebody would move one, it gets lost or we were creating a new one so I'd like to keep that in mind. Alderman O'Neil is right some are big and they have the moonshaped, which is a little bit bigger at J. P. Sullivan Square or where St. Pierre Square it. So, that's the intent. I don't want to mislead the Committee.

Alderman Gatsas asked Ron how many of these are around in the City that could be removed or lost or broken?

Mr. Ludwig replied today there are about a dozen veterans markers in different locations that maybe a lot of people don't even recognize. I'm just trying to name a few that you might know of...Morin Service Station at the intersection of Valley and Massabesic...there's one of the corner there...it is a bronze plaque and it does have the little star on the top...it's on a pole which is the way the other 12 are and they also have clips that we can put little flags on and we usually do put flags for like Memorial Day and special occasions.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's assume for a second that there was a car accident there and it was taken out...how would you put this granite.

Mr. Ludwig stated this one's on a pole, Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand but what I heard was that if the dozen or so that are existing if one is broken or stolen or needs replacement that they'd all look the same...anytime we're replacing them we would replace them with the marker that we have here at St. Pierre Square is that my understanding. So, how would you put that one there?

Mr. Ludwig replied there's room to put that style of marker there if that's what the Committee wanted to adopt going forward. Say the one was stolen at the corner of Valley maybe we'd go back with the square type style on a 2 x 2 piece of granite...those installed are like \$4,000 so typically we'd go to insurance funds to try and get money if it were stolen.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think the whole point with what we're adopting...as we move forward for whatever reason we're going to install a brand new one as Alderman Lopez stated...we have a traffic accident that damages the existing one...there are many occasions that we've done improvements to intersections that should be part of it...that's my point we just have a plan moving forward that this is the standard moving forward in recognizing any veteran.

Chairman Garrity stated I guess we'll need two motions is that correct?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated as I understand it there's two issues: one, is going forward...the Committee is looking to recommend that a standard be set for new and replacement plaques out there and the second would be for ones that are just being cleaned or repaired...you wouldn't want to replace it if it didn't need to be replaced obviously. So, I think the standard is for new and replacements and anything new or being replaced would follow that standard unless otherwise ordered and then repairs could also be done to existing one with the establishing of an account.

Chairman Garrity stated the first motion I will take will be the policy to set that standard.

Alderman O'Neil moved to the first recommendation. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I still don't understand why there is a need to set up a fund because obviously there was no fund and we have something before us here that was done for \$3,700.

Chairman Garrity interjected that was done during a road reconstruction project.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would think that whenever we need one that the money would come here rather than taking \$25,000 out of an account and just letting it sit there.

Chairman Garrity stated apparently there's 12 squares that need repairs...is that right, Ron, approximately...no...how many are in disrepair, do you have an idea?

Mr. Ludwig replied the 12 that are there are in decent shape right now...they're bronze and they're in good shape, they mount on a pole...comes down on a pole, not in granite...going to leave those the way they are they're in good shape. If

you want to start replacing those in granite...what I'm saying is you're not going to put it on exactly the same piece because the bronze plaque is a little bit larger than the one that was mounted at St. Pierre Square.

Alderman Lopez stated to answer Alderman Gatsas' question. Right now, we have the immediate problem at Sheehan/Basquil Park...that's going to be roughly defined as granite other than replacing it with a pole because three times as Ron has indicated they have removed it. So, the idea is to get a granite piece in that particular location because you do have three different types of markers over there...that piece of granite could cost \$10,000 for an example. The other thing is the Iraqi veterans...I think if we went through the markers for the veterans that have died in Iraq we're looking at roughly \$11,000. So, that's how I came up with the \$25,000. I agree with you if you don't want to spend \$25,000 that every time something comes up when it comes to the veterans we have to scramble for money or go beg for money and I'm not looking for that. For example at Bronstein Park there's a marker that needs to be replaced eventually because of deterioration. So, that's all part of it...that's all I'm asking if you wanted to start the fund at \$15,000 that could be a good start because you're going to spend \$15,000 or \$20,000 in the next six months if we had this type of program.

Alderman Gatsas stated I truly disagree with you because there's never a scrounging around looking for veterans money...we gave an exemption to veterans two years ago that surpassed anything that was being given and I think that every time the veterans have come before us looking for something this Board steps to the plate so to say we're going to set up a fund that something's going to get done, that the Board has any idea of what's going on obviously you know some numbers and by the looks of it the \$25,000 is gone and we don't even know where it's going. So, I have a problem that certain individuals on the Board kind of know where this is going and the rest of us don't because you certainly are spewing out some numbers...\$11,000 for one and the others and I think that it's only appropriate that those things come before this Board so that we all have a full understanding of what's happening.

Chairman Garrity stated that's why it's in Committee, Alderman.

Alderman Gatsas stated I agree so every time we have one...this one here before us is St. Pierre's and that's \$3,700 and I think we should approve it and every time one comes forward it should be the same as this.

Alderman Lopez stated a correct please. St. Pierre is done...that was a reconstruction...that's just an idea to give you that it's going to cost \$3,700 if we were to do that some other place. I don't want to confuse the issue on it because that's done through reconstruction.

Alderman Gatsas stated then I'll ask the obvious question...when was this approved?

Chairman Garrity replied it was approved during the project.

Alderman Gatsas stated through what this Board.

Chairman Garrity stated right, right through the committee process.

Alderman O'Neil stated the intersection was reconstruction by the Highway Department...the monument, if I may Mr. Chairman...the monument was part of the reconstruction, it was part of the budget for the reconstruction.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't think it was quite as clearly delineated as you just did.

Alderman O'Neil stated I can only speak for myself, Alderman. It was clear to me that I think Alderman Garrity brought up and said the monument there is in disrepair for the recognition of Mr. St. Pierre we should do something and as the construction project was brought before us that was asked to be included in the price of the project and I think that's one of the things being suggested moving forward. Secondly, I think there's a need to address Sheehan/Basquil immediately and then if there are new monuments to come before us they need to follow those same standards. Mr. Chairman, I think Alderman Smith was looking to be recognized.

Alderman Smith stated thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate it. I'm sure you have my notice that I sent out to you. On Memorial Day Henry J. Sweeney Post Firing Squad went over to Sheehan/Basquil Park right in front of Hunt Pool across from Gill Stadium...there were no markers there, we had family representatives there and we were sort of embarrassed and then the Commander of Sweeney Post sent a letter to the Mayor on August 3rd asking if something could be done about the situation. We're here to honor our veterans and I can't see not having markers put up there as soon as possible. It's very close to me, I would want them raised in the area...I know the both families and if anybody wants to know Lewis Basquil I think everybody knows Lewis Basquil probably the first

physical education teacher in the City of Manchester. I think we should honor the veterans, I don't think we should squabble about money at this time...get it at least started at Sheehan/Basquil Park and put those rightly deserved memorials up in their honor. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Osborne asked Alderman Lopez what are we talking about for money right now?

Alderman Lopez replied we're talking about \$10,000 or \$12,000 for Sheehan/Basquil Park...I think the Director here indicated something along that line...finding a big granite marker instead of putting them back on the poles. If you put them on the poles the kids tear them down so instead of wasting money...that's the minimum we need now and if we were to put three new markers I agree with the Chairman that we do have a marker over at Veterans Park that somebody put there and to me I think it would be more appropriate if we put a marker like so indicated in the correspondence and each of those markers are about \$3,700. So, if we did three of those then we're talking roughly \$22,000-\$23,000. If you wanted to go just to do Sheehan/Basquil Park then I think we need about \$12,000 to start off with.

Alderman Osborne asked Ron what do we need right now. What do you say that really needs to be done at the present?

Mr. Ludwig replied I don't think the Committee should confuse a single plaque which is out at a square...St. Pierre Square or another square with what you have going on at Sheehan/Basquil Park...you have three \$1,200 plaques there or two right now and one on order to be replaced by the City's self-insurance fund but you do you have three plaques there. Those three plaques can go back on three poles if you'd like us to try that again. I personally witnessed them being broken off the last time, I had a friend of mine reweld them at not cost to the City and didn't have much luck at getting them to stay there in that area...we could put them back on the exact same poles that they're on like a planter out in front of the pool at very minimal cost or we can go with something better. Granite is not inexpensive...the thought here was that it's more difficult to try and get a plaque if you counter sink it into the granite which we've been asking the monument people to do...it's more difficult to do...you can spray paint them, we can clean it and do all that but you really can't get them off.

Alderman Osborne stated like South Willow Street they had the new granite piece that was there with the plaque on it...the new concept would be like this which I

think is good because if any accident occurs there...if it's an automobile hopefully they have insurance...this would cover that particular situation and also couldn't you combine these three here onto one piece of granite?

Mr. Ludwig replied that was the idea but whether we went three separate pieces of granite, a little bit larger maybe than the one at St. Pierre Square...we were trying to get the price down and we thought that maybe grouping them together on one piece and arranging them nicely might get the price of the granite down but somehow the price seems to come out about the same so the idea was to try and lower the cost of what seems to be a pretty expensive project over at Sheehan/Basquil Park.

Alderman Osborne stated by doing this concept do you think it's a safer situation than the way we have them now...by okaying the concept itself...from now on we're going to use granite rather than poles is that it.

Mr. Ludwig stated I think that's a better way to go really.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Director comes up with an estimate on somehow trying to fit those existing three with the star on either one piece or three pieces...reports back to us with that estimate and then we figure it out. The other think I would like to recommend is maybe we pull the monument out more towards the street. If I recall it sits in the middle...there are some trees or bushes that unless you're right up on top of it you can't see the activity...maybe we consider moving the monument out towards the street...we seem to have had some success with that.

Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the initial motion for a standard policy regarding veteran's markers. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity stated the other thing I'd like to do is ask Mr. MacKenzie or Ron...I know that the Iraqi War Veterans were mentioned and I'd like to see if we could get some direction as to where the appropriate spot is on that...just come up with some estimates for the appropriate markers and monuments for our Iraqi war veterans.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we know the neighborhoods where these young people were brought up in...can we get that information.

Chairman Garrity stated sure I think that's important.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think that's a great idea.

Chairman Garrity stated I don't think we need a motion but just get some direction.

Alderman O'Neil stated if someone could do some history on where they went to high school, maybe the neighborhoods where they were brought up, maybe some appropriate places to place the monuments I think that would be great.

Chairman Garrity stated Ron could you just give us some estimates on the appropriate monuments for Iraq war veterans and just try to do some history and figure where the appropriate place is...where they grew up and things like that.

Mr. Ludwig asked would you like them to go back in the neighborhoods that they came from like most of these have.

Chairman Garrity stated give us a couple of recommendations.

Alderman O'Neil stated it may be appropriate in the neighborhood they grew up, it may be appropriate near the school they went to...grammar school, middle school or high school.

Mr. Ludwig asked I'd like to know who my best contact would be to where we stand in terms of who've we've lost so far?

Chairman Garrity replied probably Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez stated I will assist you on that but as you do that as you are well aware, Mr. Chairman, about \$3,700 for one so if we keep that in mind...we should do it. I will work with you on it, Ron.

Chairman Garrity stated if you could have something back to this Committee next month...30 days or something like that because it would be nice to do something before Memorial Day or Veterans Day.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, requesting to change the official name of Jennas Way to Jenna Way.

Alderman Duval moved to approve the request. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Communication from Chuck DePrima, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery, seeking authorization to dispose of the former Singer Park sports lights and skating rink currently in storage noting that due to the age of the equipment and the conditions under which they have been stored they no longer have any value.

Alderman Duval moved for discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Duval stated the lights for Singer Family Park was that funded by City funds, do you recall or was that funded through the sponsorship of the park back when it was established

Mr. Ludwig replied I believe it was a package when there was bond money made available to construct Singer Park in mass.

Alderman Duval stated and in both these instances...both the sports lights and the rink were they stored in a way where they could have been preserved? Was there any thought to just immediately disposing of them in as selling them closer to the time they were removed because the way this sounds like is because of poor storage the items are trashed basically.

Alderman O'Neil stated a couple of things. On the lights a number of years ago we had a presentation by folks from Goffstown with the interest in purchasing the lights but we were asked to store them until such time as they could raise money on their end. Apparently, that hasn't happened and secondly on the rink which I think is the rink that used to be at the plaza the Board has been all over the place as to what to do...there was some talk at one time about putting it down near the baseball park if I recall in some of the early planning stages so we were asked to store it. I think the Board has taken action and the department has just followed the direction of the Board in both cases.

Alderman Duval stated what I'm looking at is because they've been stored in the way they were for their demise that's the only thing here that strikes me.

Alderman O'Neil stated in defense of the department I think they put them in storage trailers of some sort. I don't think they expected we were going to have the natural disaster that we had that caused a lot of damage in the City.

Mr. Ludwig stated the component of the lights that we worked the most was actually the ballast cabinets and we had them stored in a Page Street trailer down at the Piscataquog River Park because we were asked very quickly to come in and be ready to accept those lights at Singer Park when they came down. I was here saying to let them go with the deal because there's really not a lot of value in these lights at the time, however, that didn't happen and we were asked to at least spend \$15,000 to have the lights moved and I've been storing them at a cost of \$100/month and before we could get them to Goffstown because they just couldn't fund raise enough to take them over we got five feet of water over there and effectively the ballast again which had the most valuable components of the lights themselves are now all trashed because they got wet in the trailer which isn't much you can do.

Alderman Osborne in reference to the ice rink asked Ron is it still usable?

Mr. Ludwig replied the ice rink is a great college try so to speak. What it was... the compressor is a packaged unit, very small with capabilities of supporting a rink of about 40 x 70 so an adult would probably take three strides and he's at the other end of the rink. The compressor unit may have very minimal value at this point but my problem is it's been stored on the west side, we've had it buttoned up over there but people keep breaking into it and stealing copper off of it and different things like that and it's a same...again, I continue to spend \$100/month to store it and it's components in a Page Street trailer when we had nothing to do with this in the first place.

Alderman Osborne asked to use that right now how much would it take to set that up?

Mr. Ludwig replied I can't tell you that honestly right now. I can tell you that it was a \$20,000 cost to set it up and take it down. It's not portable in the true sense of the word portable. If you got it into an application as Alderman O'Neil was speaking to maybe in a location of Verizon and you got it into a small cement slab and you could hide the compressor unit in some shrubs someplace or in a small shelter it becomes probably a unit that could have been used by somebody but several opportunities have been missed.

Alderman Osborne stated it wouldn't create any value if it was up at McIntyre.

Mr. Ludwig stated not to me up there it wouldn't.

Alderman Osborne stated it wouldn't help anything up that way. Just food for thought.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a couple of other thoughts. Ron, am I correct that at one point the lights from Singer were going to head towards the Memorial project until it was determined that they would not properly serve because of the track and everything else...it was a different layout than Singer and it would have cost us as much to rehab those lights than to install new ones is point number one. And, secondly, I was down in Boston in December and stayed overnight and it was kind of nice...I don't know if we'd ever do it but the pond in Boston Common there was an awful lot of people skating in the downtown area but that's about five or six times the size of this particular rink.

Alderman Duval moved to authorize disposition of the sports lights and skating rink. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, requesting final funding in the amount of \$5,300,000 for the Granite Street Project.

Alderman Osborne moved to discussion. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Committee I think has had a couple of presentations by the Highway Department on this project. As you may remember the funding from the federal level and the City has paid for a majority of the project but \$5.3 million is required to complete the project from Commercial Street easterly to Elm Street. So, that's what's before the Committee and ultimately the Board right now and representatives of the Highway Department and their consultant are also here.

Alderman O'Neil stated for Mr. Sheppard...Kevin we have enough money through the contracts that have been bid to complete the work to Commercial Street correct?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct. One thing that is part of this final contract is the landscaping for the whole corridor from South Main up through Elm and the

thought on that...this is Roch Larochelle from CLD Engineers...once those are completed we would complete the landscape along the full corridor.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's in this budget.

Mr. Sheppard stated it's not spelled out in that budget but it's part of that east end contract.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's the entire corridor.

Mr. Sheppard stated correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked any idea how we're going to do this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would note that the Mayor's last proposal for a two-year budget was well under the bonding capacity that we have. For two years we have typically had \$20 million. The Mayor's proposal was just over \$10 million and I think the CIP Committee brought that down to an even \$10 million. So, there is bonding capacity to pay for this within that \$20 million program.

Chairman Garrity asked does that answer your question, Alderman? I guess you're looking for a budget year.

Alderman O'Neil stated that but it's also then it's going to be competing with other projects that we'd like to do.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Board did pass a two-year budget of just \$10 million. You do have the capacity and the ability to add to that as a Board if you'd like. I do still have to check whether there'd have to be an additional hearing involved if you wanted to do that fairly shortly. As we go into our FY08 budget there is no other bonding planned. As we go into that process we are not planning on any other bonding because the \$10 million was to cover two years. So, under what has been the Bond Counsel's advice we have \$20 million over two years and so far we've only taken up \$10 million of that.

Alderman O'Neil stated Bob that would mean that we could buy additional fire trucks, we could do more park projects correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated the money that we received from the civic center on a yearly basis can that be earmarked directly to the payment of a bond for the \$5.3 million because that's really where it drops out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Board did establish...I know a portion of that at least goes into an Arts fund and that was necessary to avoid as I remember some additional payments that the City would have to make. So, I think the money that comes from Verizon does already go into a fund that's earmarked for the arts.

Alderman Gatsas stated the whole thing.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I can't say for sure...I could check that.

Alderman Gatsas stated if memory serves me correctly we're receiving about \$400,000/year.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes and the Arts fund was only \$100,000/year.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we check with Finance to see if we can set up a dedicated fund to pay for this?

Mr. MacKenzie stated so there would be a stream that we would then pay the bond based upon that future stream.

Alderman Gatsas stated correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we can check into that.

Alderman Gatsas stated because you could probably do it by a 10 or 15-year amortization if we're getting \$400,000/year.

Alderman O'Neil stated number one this is not new information to us. We knew all along based on votes we've taken that there may be the possibility that we don't fund Commercial Street to Elm Street. I hope there wasn't a thought trying...I thought it was clear that the Board in our votes knew there was a possibility we were not going to fund depending on our financial situation Commercial to Elm because there's no additional lanes...all it is really is...it's not realigning the road.

Mr. Sheppard stated in our last presentation I believe was August of 2005 before this Committee. At that time we laid out this project breaking it out into three phases...two other phases are currently under construction and at that time we had told the Committee as well that we'd be back looking for I believe \$5.150 million...it \$5.3 million at this point that we're looking for. I wasn't at that meeting but if that's what you say.

Alderman O'Neil stated I remember...I was the Chairman of CIP at the time and the reality was we...I don't recall that we ever committed and said two years from now we're going to commit to fund...I think the reality was that the situation at the time and if we were in a position to do it we would but the project could theoretically stop at Commercial Street...that's what I remember.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'll ask Roch.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe some of the others that served on the CIP Committee might remember.

Chairman Garrity stated I thought we were taking it in steps at that point.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't even remember that we said we would even consider in the future funding that improvement.

Mr. Roch Larochelle, CLD Engineering, Inc., stated conceptually yes...possibly. I think one of the things that the Board needs to realize is that if you leave Granite Street the way it is today there is a pretty severe hook coming off of Commercial Street you'll have to negotiate going onto the new bridge...we'll have a new bridge there that is ready to accept all of the ultimate lanes. There are some other components...in the last contract what we call the "E" Contract which goes up to Elm Street including the widening and reconstruction of the railroad corridor to accept the new lanes, improvements to their signal systems to help facilitate traffic movement through there. The other important components in the project including new signal systems and interconnect all the way up to Elm Street to make that corridor work efficiently, to process the traffic, to take full advantage of all of the improvements that you already have under construction in that corridor. It's not just constructing sidewalks and putting trees in the ground. In fact the landscape component probably only makes up about \$300,000 of the overall project and that would be essentially for trees and bushes and things like that. It was decided that that would be held to the end of the contract so that none of that stuff would be destroyed as the contracts moved through construction. So, conceivably you could, it wouldn't be a completed product. It wouldn't work as anticipated. It wouldn't work as well as far as processing the traffic through the area.

Alderman O'Neil asked can you repeat what you just said...just that last about it working and not working.

Mr. Larochelle stated it wouldn't work very well to process the traffic through there because the design was put together as an integrated system to process traffic all the way from South Main through the interchange to work with the trains, the

railroad crossings all the way up to Elm Street to process traffic off of Elm Street to get it through the Millyard District and to make it work well down there without major bottlenecks and also to relieve congestion at Exits 4 and 6.

Alderman O'Neil stated within the current budget that's been approved will improvements at Commercial and Granite Streets happen.

Mr. Larochelle stated no.

Alderman O'Neil asked where does it stop then?

Mr. Larochelle stated where does it stop.

Alderman O'Neil stated the signals at Commercial and Granite are not getting redone. Any additional lanes are not being created up to Commercial Street.

Mr. Larochelle stated what's under construction right now ends at Commercial Street with the widening of the bridge.

Alderman O'Neil stated correct. Are there signal improvements at the intersection of Commercial and Granite?

Mr. Larochelle replied yes that signal system will be in place.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I recall and I hope I don't sound confrontational but many of us were around then and we did not know the position the City would be in and I for one hope that there was never, it never went back that there was a commitment to move forward with that last portion. Am I correct that there are no additional sidewalks, there's no additional change in the roadway, there's no property acquisition...it's generally I'll call it cosmetic.

Mr. Larochelle stated another thing that needs to be considered is that there have been property acquisitions. One of the things that we needed to do that's helped secure the federal funding and get the reimbursement from the State Federal Highway was to clear the right-of-way for the ultimate project and so there have been purchases of right-of-way including the B&M Railroad, WMUR, the Fleet...

Alderman O'Neil interjected but not Commercial Street.

Mr. Larochelle stated no that's not true that property has been acquired to the sum of about \$335,000. Now, if the City decides to not construct that portion of the project there is a possibility that Federal Highway will require that money to be given back where the City has already received money back for those expenditures.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if it's appropriate tonight but maybe need to schedule this for another meeting. This is the first time I've heard that Federal Highway funds would be in jeopardy if we don't do from Commercial to Elm Street...that was never presented to us before.

Chairman Garrity stated I would also like to hear from Finance and see if we can use some of the Verizon funds.

Alderman O'Neil stated I was always led to believe if we stopped at Commercial that was a decision by this Board. Alderman Forest is telling me he remembers the same thing.

Chairman Garrity stated it will accept a motion to table with a report due next month.

Alderman O'Neil stated with a formal presentation next month.

Chairman Garrity stated sure.

Alderman Smith stated I have the Granite Street Widening 2003 and Alderman O'Neil is absolutely correct in his assumption...it was stopping at Commercial Street right after Loeb Plaza and Cote Street and most of it was proposed landscaping, streetscape elements and everything like that and this was at the hearing on February 10, 2003 and I was on the CIP Committee at the time and I concur with Alderman O'Neil that this is a situation if we were going to continue. They have it here broken down \$19 million + dollars and nothing involved from Commercial Street to Elm Street...it's proposed here but that's all.

Chairman Garrity asked Kevin is this time sensitive?

Mr. Sheppard replied it is somewhat time sensitive. We're looking to prequalify contractors in February, we put it out to bid in March...as a minimum I'd like to be able to go out and prequalify...I don't think anyone would have an issue for prequalifying contractors that's not a cost really to the contracts it's just submitting financial information.

Mr. Larochelle stated it's time sensitive in the fact that we're trying to wrap up all the contracts by the end of 2008 so it would be consistent with the timing of the State's Exit 5 contract that they're trying to wrap up at the same time. The intent was to finish everything all at once so you don't have protracted construction seasons through the area.

Chairman Garrity stated we have a full Board on the 6th of February. We could schedule a presentation in front of CIP towards the end of the month if you'd like to do that Gentlemen.

Alderman Osborne stated if we stop at Commercial Street that bridge widening where the old Cott's used to be...I remember Cott's Bottling used to be there and they tore that all out...you're saying we have to hook that wouldn't you...how are you going to keep on going from that particular commercial Street on straight on situation...you can't do that can you?

Mr. Larochelle stated that's the point you wouldn't.

Alderman Osborne interjected can I ask just a couple of questions so you can answer them all at once. What's going to happen if we don't do from Commercial Street to Elm Street? What's going to happen if that wasn't funded? You say we're going to lose money.

Mr. Larochelle stated there's a possibility that the State Federal Highway may ask that money to be returned. It does not mean that it could not be reauthorized in a different form although that's something that would have to be taken up with the Federal Highway Administration and the State DOT.

Mr. Sheppard stated what he's talking about...not the full \$14.9 million. He's talking about the piece of the money that was used to purchase that property.

Chairman Garrity stated I think what's important is we're going to have a presentation probably the week after next.

Alderman Osborne stated myself I think it would be kind of foolish to quit there...you're going to do something let's do it.

Chairman Garrity stated if we're going to make a \$5.3 million decision let's make sure we're all on the same page.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would just suggest...I recall that presentation that was made, there was one made after some point later...I don't remember the date and I remember the specific discussion...other Aldermen are telling me they remember it as well where if the project stopped at Commercial Street because there was no roadway widening, etc. that it was generally landscaping type issues all the way up. Now, we're hearing something different tonight...that's not what we were told at that time.

Mr. Sheppard stated we can check back...right now, in discussing with Dennis I agree with what Dennis is saying. I believe potentially at that time it might have been from Canal up to Elm because Commercial up to Canal is a transition back into the existing...from Canal up to Elm there really aren't any major lane widenings but from Commercial up to Canal is a transition back into the existing.

Alderman O'Neil stated but that's funded isn't it.

Mr. Sheppard stated no.

Alderman O'Neil stated Canal to Commercial is not funded.

Mr. Sheppard stated correct. The last contract would go from Commercial up to Elm Street.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could jump in, Mr. Chairman, because I'm not sure if Alderman O'Neil...

Chairman Garrity stated hold on...what's the cost from Commercial to Canal?

Mr. Sheppard replied roughly \$5 million.

Chairman Garrity stated I will take a motion to table and we'll have a presentation by the appropriate parties at a meeting to be scheduled maybe next week or the week after.

Alderman Gatsas moved to table. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity stated the Clerk's office will be in touch.

Mr. Sheppard stated in the meantime...

Chairman Garrity stated I realize it's time sensitive so we'll get there. We all need to be on the same page.

Mr. Sheppard stated we may end up...as long as the Committee's okay with that... if the timing doesn't work going out to prequalify contractors that's like I say a minimal cost.

Chairman Garrity asked does anyone have a problem with Kevin going out to prequalify contractors. There's no cost to the City, right.

Mr. Sheppard stated right.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, on behalf of Alderman Osborne, seeking the Committee's authorization to locate funding for the installation of flashing signals at the intersection of Massabesic and Cypress Streets.

Alderman Osborne stated Mr. MacKenzie do you want to explain where the money's coming from.

Mr. MacKenzie stated after the Board meeting last week we did look...basically, it would have to be cash. We had originally looked at all of Alderman Osborne's request in traffic signal type funds to see if money was available and it was not. It would have to come...there are two cash project balances that it could come from. One would be the Kimball Street Traffic Study, which was completed, and there's a balance from that as well as the Crystal Lake Master Plan...that was completed and there is a balance from that. So, it would have to come from two because the amounts are so small at this point that we'd have to get two of those balances to fund the roughly \$4,250 as we understood it.

Chairman Garrity asked is that the cost?

Alderman Osborne replied that's the cost.

Alderman Osborne moved to approve the funding request. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated the stop signs went in...was this always part of when the stop signs were going in or was this afterwards?

Alderman Osborne replied the who thing here is when you have 4-wy stop signs in an area like that where the view is not too visible in a couple of directions there I thought it would be best to have this because of the situation of people not seeing it as they're coming around the curb hitting Massabesic Street. So, this was here you could see it all the way up Massabesic because it would be extending out into the middle of the road. I know we've got a report here from the Police station and I could bring it up...I requested one quite awhile ago, I already know what the accident report was there but the corner's always been an accident place waiting to happen in the first place. It's a situation now where we have 4-wy stop signs and at that particular corner it's not boxed like say on Cilley Road and Jewett Street. Those four corners are completely square so it's very easy for each car to see each other but when we get up Cypress Street and you're heading south on Cypress Street and you stop there at the market and you try to look to the left it's a brown spot as cars are coming down Massabesic Street and even at a speed of 30 mph is quite fast through any intersection in this City. If you go 30 mph through an intersection standing there you'd swear you're going 50 mph. So, I am just trying to make it as safe as possible...when I was an Alderman 20-25 years ago I had a lot of requests of doing something then. So, this particular corner has been long overdue. I think the low amount of money that we're asking for here \$4,250 is very small to try to save a fatality on that particular corner. It's not happened yet but I don't want to wait and be the Alderman there when it does happen. So, this is all I'm asking for is \$4,250 and that would complete that intersection.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. MacKenzie what is the balance on the...what are the two funds and what's the balances on those two accounts? Balance available I guess is my question.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the balance available in the Crystal Lake Master Plan is \$726.52 and the balance on the Campbell Traffic Study is \$5,800. So we would only be taking a portion of that \$5,800.

Chairman Garrity stated but those two projects are totally complete so there's no need for the balances.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Chairman Garrity stated because Alderman Roy just frantically called Alderman Lopez and I guess that's not the deal.

Alderman Lopez stated for the record Alderman Roy just called me and he's not in favor of taking that money out of Campbell Street there are still projects up there that he's looking at as Alderman of Ward 1...just to pass on to the Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have Highway Department here and maybe they can verify that that study is complete or not, if he wants to.

Chairman Garrity stated Mr. Sheppard...Alderman Roy is awaiting your answer from home.

Mr. Sheppard stated I believe there was \$25,000 allocated for that...that study was completed last year and there is a balance in that project at this time. We haven't moved that money or asked to move the money around only for the fact that if this project...the Campbell Street project did move forward in the future these would be funds to potentially update that traffic signal at that time dependent upon when that project might move forward or to be put toward that project. But, we've submitted as part of the FY08 CIP requests based on what Mr. MacKenzie said that there would be no bonding potentially as part of this project...that project may not move forward until FY09.

Alderman Gatsas asked can somebody help me...how long has this been a 4-way stop?

Mr. Sheppard replied roughly a month maybe.

Alderman Osborne stated no it's longer than that...I'd say probably three.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected the November meeting.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why we can't...I can think of about seven or eight different places in Ward 2 that could use a blinking red light.

Alderman Osborne stated maybe you should have brought it forward I don't know. I bringing this forward, I'm asking and that's it. 'm sure there's a lot of places.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think certainly if someone wants to talk about a dangerous corner Bridge and Belmont is probably the most dangerous corner in the City that something should be done at. Now, maybe a stoplight should be put there which certainly has more traffic input into the City and out of the City than Cypress and Massabesic Streets. If it's \$4,200 then I would take the \$4,200 and talk to my colleague from Ward 4 and say let's institute a light on Bridge Street because that's probably a spot that people call you on a daily basis about the

traffic that's there and Alderman Duval obviously had a store across the street and only he can tell us how many times he called the police to take care of an accident there.

Alderman Duval stated there's no doubt that we could use some help at the intersection of Bridge and Belmont and Hall and Bridge...I think it's well-documented and the request that was made earlier in the year and I was told by way of the experts that it wasn't justified...interestingly. As far as I'm concerned it's well justified not to get off the subject too much but it occurs to me that there are a number of problematic areas throughout our City and I think the ward aldermen do know best with regard to which intersections create the most potential for disaster. For that reason I'll support the request of Alderman Osborne but to be honest with you there's a number of hotspots throughout the City that need attention and I know that the Bridge and Belmont intersection would be huge by comparison.

Alderman Osborne stated I think I know what Alderman Duval is talking about because I went up there myself...he knows that and looked at that corner and made a few suggestions myself and I think right now there is a yellow blinker there, isn't there.

Mr. Duval stated yes there is.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't know what else you could do for blinders in that particular intersection outside of signal itself. I think that would be the only other thing you could do there. He's already got what I'm talking about there now. So, I don't know where Alderman Gatsas is coming from.

Alderman Gatsas stated it's not a 4-way stop.

Alderman Osborne stated no I wouldn't think so...that's up to him if he wants to try to make it a 4-way stop I'd have no problem with anything an Alderman wants in his ward...he knows his ward best...I've lived in mine for 67 years. So, I think I know it quite well. I appreciate it thank you.

Chairman Garrity stated when I was back on the Traffic Committee back four years ago wasn't there a policy set that 4-way stops can only go in a school zone. Is that the policy? Do we have anyone from Traffic here, no.

Alderman Forest stated you are right, Alderman Garrity, because you know how I feel about 4-way stop signs.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm going to support my colleague but I for one am not a fan of 4-way stop signs...all they do is cause people to run them, they should not be used to control speed, there is absolutely standards that engineers who make a living doing traffic use. With all due respect to my colleague from Ward 5 I don't believe Massabesic and Cypress meets those standards...believe or not Highland and Bridge and Belmont and Bridge did not meet the standards based on the number of accidents and that was done by a professional engineer. I think one of the things we've got to do is slow down with these installations of 4-way stop signs. In some cases they cause more problems than were there before. I will support...the installation of those stop signs is done, I will support my colleague on this but I will make it clear going forward I'm going to be very cautious about 4-way stop signs and any more of these blinking lights in the City of Manchester. We need to have a process professionally reviewed and not just ward aldermen saying I want a 4-way stop sign and put a blinker up there. There are professional standards that need to be done in this City but I will support him on this one.

Chairman Garrity stated after doing a little research today it didn't go through the Traffic Committee not as a 4-way stop sign though and I think that's why some of the Aldermen didn't catch it.

Alderman Gatsas stated for clarification, Carol, can you tell me how that went through Traffic.

Chairman Garrity stated I don't think it was intentional it was just...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Traffic Committee typically if there's a 4-way stop when the Traffic agenda is submitted by the Traffic Division would put a notation on there as a 4-way stop and in this instance they did not do that, it was listed as another one of the stop signs being installed so it would have been easy for an Alderman to vote on it and approve the stop sign at the request of the ward alderman because the ward alderman's name was there without realizing they were putting in a 4-way stop. There has been a policy by the Traffic Committee... it's a long-standing policy that was set a few years back and that policy said that they were not going to put in 4-way stops in other than school zone areas and it had to be pretty well justified.

Alderman Gatsas stated so what you're saying is the only thing that came before the Board was only a stop sign on Massabesic.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it was a stop sign on Massabesic at Cypress for the northeast and southeast corner but the other corners had been done years ago so they were already existing on the Cypress Street side of it.

Alderman Gatsas asked has the request for the flashing gone to Traffic?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied that I could not tell you for sure. I don't believe so. I don't believe the Traffic Committee has acted on that.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why it's at CIP before it goes to Traffic so that there's an input by the Police Department?

Chairman Garrity replied because I think they needed a funding source and contingency was mentioned and we were a little cautious to go toward contingency so that's why it's here.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand it's the ward alderman I just don't understand what those flashing lights are going to do where there's a 4-way stop now. Obviously we start looking at allocation of funds from different projects...if somebody said to me the 4-way stops have been there for a year and the traffic accidents haven't slowed down then I might say then maybe it's a safety process but if we're only had it for two or three months we don't know whether the stop signs have changed the process of accidents or not. So, why wouldn't we wait to find out if the 4-way stops has done anything for the accident situation.

Chairman Garrity asked are you representing the Traffic Division, Kevin?

Mr. Sheppard replied I can try to answer...past policies are what Carol said. I wasn't familiar with that policy but I'll make sure that when we submit agendas in the future that that gets on the agenda.

Chairman Garrity stated the reason why I did a little research is because Alderman Forest's ears always perk up when he sees a 4-way stop signs.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'm surprised that that was a policy that didn't happen when that went forward but I'll make sure it does happen in the future when we prepare the agendas.

Chairman Garrity asked do you have any funds in your budget to take care of this item?

Mr. Sheppard replied in the budget no.

Alderman O'Neil stated am I hearing from CIP staff that there are no other than the particular projects that they recognized here...there are no cash balances in any other projects.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there are no closeout projects other than these two.

Alderman O'Neil stated then the only other alternative we have is contingency, correct.

Chairman Garrity stated yes and the sense of the Board was being cautious about using contingency at this time of year.

Alderman O'Neil moved that it be shot down at the full Board but I'll move \$4,250 out of contingency.

Chairman Garrity stated we have a motion on the table already don't we.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Alderman Osborne by Alderman Duval to approve the \$4,250.

Alderman O'Neil stated but they never said the funding source.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the funding source was presumed to be that of the CIP staff....that's the way I understood it.

Chairman Garrity stated I know that Alderman Roy has told us he has a concern about Campbell Street and I'm quite sure it has to do with the project he's trying to move forward up there.

Alderman O'Neil asked what is the source?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied the source for that motion was to transfer from those two projects unless they want to amend the motion.

Alderman Osborne stated \$5,000 is being held up back there for Campbell Street...how long is it going to stay there this \$5,000 when I can move forward with what I'm talking about and this \$5,000 can be replenished or whatever at a later date...how long are you going to leave something hanging in one area when it could be used and it might save a life in another...who knows that.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion. The motion failed with Aldermen O'Neil, Gatsas and Garrity duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil moved that \$4,000 be taken out of contingency. There was no second.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 16 of the agenda:

16. Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, submitting the 1st and 2nd Progress Report for the Manchester Area Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 17 of the agenda:

17. Sewer abatement request (56 Wellington Court).
(Note: EPD recommends an abatement in the amount of \$37.80 be granted.)

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve EPD recommendation that \$37.80 be granted. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 18 of the agenda:

18. Sewer abatement request (206 Ash Street).
(Note: EPD recommends an abatement in the amount of \$259.20 be granted.)

Alderman Duval moved to approve EPD recommendation that \$259.20 be granted. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 19 of the agenda:

19. Sewer abatement request (356 Belmont Street).
(Note: EPD does not recommend an abatement at this time.)

Alderman O'Neil moved on the EPD recommendation to not approve at this time. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity asked are you here to speak to Item 19, Ma'am? You will need come to the microphone...state your name and address please.

Ms. Beverly Turner, 356 Belmont Street, Manchester, NH, stated: I was not aware of the EPD recommendation although I've made several phone calls there so I come today because this is the first time I've been before this group to find out how this would proceed. So, it's sounds as though a decision has already been made.

Chairman Garrity stated I do have to get a motion on the floor before we discuss it.

Ms. Turner stated I'm sorry I don't know the process.

Alderman Gatsas stated is there a motion?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there was a motion to accept the recommendation to not grant an abatement is the motion at this time.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there someone here from EPD that can speak on it.

Chairman Garrity called upon Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Sheppard stated in looking at the backup material it appears that there was excess water usage...if you looked at the backup correspondence that went with this there was excess water being used at this residence. I believe Water Works was called out and they found no issue with the water service or any leaks within the building. I believe the owner of the building tried to get access where she rents the building, had trouble getting access to the property and she could probably maybe give you more detail if you wishes to listen. From what I understand is that they've worked out a payment plan with this owner at no interest because our recommendation or is not to abate this. It must have been something internal to the building that created this excess water usage and typically our policy is that if this water does get into the sewer system we do not recommend abatements unless there's extenuating circumstances and in this case it may have been a tenant that was running the tub or faucet or leaky toilet or whatever it may have been but eventually that water made it into our sewer main. We cannot control what tenants are doing within buildings, therefore, it is our recommendation not to recommend an abatement for this.

Chairman Garrity stated your Mrs. Turner, right, what happened?

Ms. Turner stated I learned after the tenant had moved out of a \$2,500+ sewer bill for one quarter which was pretty financially devastating on top of the other \$7,500 of expenses that those tenants had cost me in getting them out. I did go through

the process of bringing in a plumber and checking everywhere for leaks and having City Water come over to check the meter and it just never occurred to me that potentially a tenant would just run a faucet for no apparent reason and there was a leaky toilet, a toilet that kept running when I took position of the property and I don't know how long that had taken place but I had great difficulty in getting access the tenants actually changed the locks on the property at the time I was trying to enter with the City inspector for the COC (Certificate of Compliance) so I just want through several months of great difficulty and went through the abatement process in the hope that some of the financial stress from this whole situation could be relieved.

Chairman Garrity stated the total cost is \$1,050.

Ms. Turner stated the sewer bill was \$1,508.40.

Alderman O'Neil stated that was the total bill for that period.

Ms. Turner stated that was the sewer portion.

Alderman O'Neil asked what would a normal sewer portion be in that same time period? I was trying to look for that in one of the letters.

Ms. Tuner replied about \$200-210.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's seven times her normal bill and one of the things even in the supporting backup from the staff at EPD was...there was a line... 'as the homeowner had never been late with payments on this property'...I don't know...this is one I kind of sympathize with a little bit. We've been able with some of the other times in the past that we've not recommended or where the staff has not recommended there's been very good documentation on what happened and sometimes the homeowner or property owner hasn't been responsive in correcting the problem but in this particular one that doesn't seem to be the case.

Chairman Garrity asked do I have a motion on the table?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied there was a motion by Alderman O'Neil, seconded by Alderman Duval to accept the recommendation not to grant an abatement.

Chairman Garrity asked would you like to rescind that motion.

Alderman O'Neil replied I would, Mr. Chairman.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied it has then been rescinded.

Chairman Garrity asked do I have a new motion?

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. Sheppard is waving frantically over there.

Mr. Sheppard stated I know some payments have been toward this bill so if the Committee is gearing towards abating or granting the abatement I'm not sure they want to take into consideration the payments that have already been made because otherwise if you plan to abate this whole thing she would have a credit now...she has a balance of roughly \$850.00 I believe.

Ms. Turner stated \$850.00 is the balance.

Alderman O'Neil stated so she has rightfully been making the payments...point being that she didn't fight it, she didn't hold it off until this process was all through, she made the payments.

Mr. Sheppard stated correct. The procedure is if payment is not made in full it gets sent I believe to the City Clerk's office for collection or however it works. Because of this process we worked out a payment plan with her, we did not send it for collection, where she paid \$228.40 the first month and \$100.00 per month thereafter. We understood that that was a high bill for one person to grant in a quarter so we did work out a payment plan.

Alderman O'Neil asked is this kind of a unique kind of situation...this specific type of situation?

Mr. Sheppard replied definitely it's a unique situation. We bring all abatements before this Committee and I don't think you typically see something this size.

Alderman O'Neil stated usually it's not over that big a dollar amount.

Alderman Gatsas stated Ms. Turner can you tell me what happened with your water bill.

Ms. Turner replied the water bill I've been making payments monthly on that too. I made like 4344.00 an initial payment and then with that one I've been making \$50.00 monthly payments because that's an extra \$150.00 out of my income.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the Water Works did no abatement for you.

Ms. Turner stated I was not given any indication that there was an abatement for the water...I'm under the impression that I have to pay that regardless of what happens with the sewer. So, I have a balance of \$500.00 left on that one so I've paid just over half of that.

Alderman Duval asked can you tell me is this an owner-occupied unit...do you live in the unit?

Ms. Turner replied it was originally my home for a little under three and a half years and then I moved out of it to renovate another property for 18 months. The lease which was a corporate tenant defaulted on the lease and exited it six months early owing rent and a lot of damaged to the property and then in conjunction to that we had all of the rains that have taken place this year and I've spent several thousands of dollars on roofs and foundation and support work. So, the long and the short of it is it was a very expensive ordeal and certainly questioning moving out but I am living back in the home so currently yes it is an owner-occupied unit.

Alderman Duval stated it does appear that it was a direct result of abusive tenants, it sounds that way through the process of elimination.

Ms. Turner stated certainly the last few months turned out that way. It didn't appear that way the first year. Unfortunately, I've discovered being in social services that when life happens to people they don't always handle it as you would like and it appeared that I and the property was on the end of them not liking the circumstances of their life unfortunately despite the fact that I tried everything to be a good landlord that kept on top of things with good open lines of communication and I have all the written documentation of the letters back and forth. I know that Larry Caron who was the COC Inspector at the time had spoken with the wife of the tenant and they sang my praises so despite the fact that there was damage and everything done they still thought that I was a good landlord not that that particularly helps in this situation.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is a very unique situation and based on that I will move on granting the abatement. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can I just verify what the amount of the abatement would be?

Ms. Turner stated I currently owe \$500.00 on the water and I owe \$850.00 on the sewer and I know we're only talking about the sewer.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think we have any jurisdiction on the water.

Chairman Garrity stated I guess the thing to do would...they could probably figure this out, Kevin...just take her average and then just abate the over...

Ms. Tuner interjected at this point I would be open to any assistance.

Alderman O'Neil asked Ms. Turner are you okay moving forward and not trying to reclaim whatever the abatement...I don't know if that will create more paperwork.

Ms. Turner replied I'm happy with whatever decision that you make.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated then it would be the balance of \$850.00 that she currently owes.

Chairman Garrity stated yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated and not try to...I'm sure it can be done but it might create more paperwork than...Kevin is that a pretty easy process going forward as opposed to trying to figure out going back.

Mr. Sheppard stated I would think the balance would be the easiest process.

Alderman O'Neil asked does that sound fair, Ms. Turner.

Ms. Turner replied that sounds wonderful, thank you so much.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's included in my motion then.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.

TABLED ITEMS

20. Petition to discontinue a portion of So. Bedford Street.
*(Tabled 07/11/2006. On July 11, 2006, the BMA voted to refer this matter also to the Special Committee on Riverfront Activities and Baseball.
Tabled in Riverfront Committee on 11/13/2006.)*

This item remained tabled.

21. Request of Alderman Forest seeking funding for the rehabilitation of the playground and resurfacing of the basketball court at Blodgett Park.
(Tabled 08/14/2006)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to remove item 21 from the table for discussion.

Chairman Garrity stated it would be my recommendation to address this in the next budget season.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the request be referred to the FY08 budget cycle. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

22. Communication from Lowell Terrace Associates proposing a mortgage/debt consolidation for property located at the northwest corner of Lowell and Chestnut Streets.
(Tabled 08/14/2006. Further information submitted by Finance enclosed.)

This item remained tabled.

23. Petition to discontinue Pamela Circle submitted by the Airport Director.
(Tabled 10/23/2006 pending City Solicitor review. Highway Department supports petition for discontinuance.)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to remove item 23 from the table for discussion.

Chairman Garrity stated Tom and I had a discussion about that earlier trying to figure out what our request was for the City Solicitor.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that was because there was a question as to whether it was a discontinuance or discharge.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated this would be a discontinuance because it was dedicated on a plan and it was opened and built as public works.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the motion would be to refer it to a road hearing.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mike you still want the discontinuance.

Alderman O'Neil moved to refer the petition to discontinue Pamela Circle to a road hearing. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

24. Security estimate provided by Pelmac Industries for property located behind the West Side Ice Arena and the Jr. Deb Softball field.
(Tabled 10/23/2006 pending reports from City staff.)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to remove item 24 from the table for discussion.

Alderman Forest stated the reason I'm here is it's my monthly bugging of this Committee trying to figure out where this item stands. As you know it's been on the table for a while and in the meantime there's more vandalism and more illegal activities happening behind the West Side Ice Arena and I'd like to know where we stand on the funding for this.

Chairman Garrity asked do we have a report from City staff? I hope we do because we've been requesting one since 10/23/2006.

Alderman O'Neil moved that we get a report from Parks, Recreation & Cemetery as well as the Facilities Division of Public Works and why I say that I have an issue with the security people now doing lighting on city-owned buildings when maybe we have in-house electricians that can do it and save a few dollars on it.

Alderman Forest stated with this project there wouldn't be any lighting at all...they're infrared systems.

Alderman O'Neil stated they've got lighting on here for \$4,000.

Alderman Forest stated I haven't seen that estimate.

Alderman O'Neil stated so a report from the two of them including Facilities to see if they can get the electrical portions of it done in-house.

Chairman Garrity stated I think part of that report was a possible funding sources.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we don't have any report at this time on this project.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe the three departments can get together (planning, Facilities and Parks) and determine what can be done in-house and what needs to be contracted out.

Chairman Garrity stated the Committee made a request for staff to give us a report back in October and we still don't have it and it's right there on the agenda...in fact I'll read it to you..."tabled 10/23/2006 pending reports from City staff".

Mr. MacKenzie stated I'd like to believe our staff is always fairly prompt I'm not sure why there's no report on this I'm not sure if it was asked of us.

Chairman Garrity stated can we bring it up at the next meeting.

Alderman O'Neil stated can I ask a question of Alderman Forest, Mr. Chairman. Has police recommended anything that would improve, are they involved...I know they've been helpful to a lot of businesses...former Sgt. Doughty...is Mr. Robidas doing that too.

Alderman Forest stated Red has been working with Kevin Kincaid and again myself but mostly Kevin Kincaid and Red and I believe I'm trying to think...I believe Red talked to Chuck DePrima and everything else and the three of them have been together and came up with this solution here to the problem down there.

Chairman Garrity asked are you okay with putting it back on the table till we get a report.

Alderman Forest replied I am.

Alderman O'Neil moved to retable item #24.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can we get clarification as to what departments your looking for reports from and what you want.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm looking for Parks, Facilities Division and CIP to sit down number one to identify what work facilities can do in-house. Secondly, after that's determined what the true funding source to do the improvements needed. What is that budget and thirdly what is the funding source to do it.

Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion to retable. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication from Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department advising that a 1995 Chevrolet Caprice and a 1999 Ford Crown Victoria both recycle police cruisers which are in poor condition and requesting that consideration be given to replace the two vehicles with other recycle cruisers when available.

Chairman Garrity stated Mr. Sheppard we'll this to you.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'm familiar with this letter. It's up to the Committee...what happens is we get recycle police cruisers when they bring new cruisers on line. What they're asking is if two cruisers come off line and they're in decent shape that they be allowed to bring them over.

Chairman Garrity stated there's not a waiting list for those cruisers are there.

Mr. Sheppard stated not right now and I believe there are some cruisers that will be coming off line.

Alderman O'Neil stated at some point we need to take a look at in the long run is it cheaper for us to buy smaller vehicles, better fuel efficiency, etc, etc. than recycling. I know Keene went through s similar program maybe we can do some research at some point. We're not alone apparently on recycling Crown Victoria's with huge engines and all that. Not a motion, just a thought.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Duval, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee